DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 440 968 SP 039 205

AUTHOR Meister, Denise G.
TITLE Teachers and Change: Examining the Literature.
PUB DATE 2000-04-00
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 24-28, 2000).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Responsibility; Change Strategies; *Educational Change; Educational Innovation; Elementary Secondary Education; Faculty Development; Leadership Responsibility; Teacher Responsibility; Time Factors (Learning)

ABSTRACT

This paper synthesizes the literature on educational change that analyzes why reform is so difficult for teachers to implement and how schools can alleviate some of the difficulties in order to ensure effectiveness. The first section explains difficulties with educational change and details barriers to change. Barriers include lack of time in the work day; intensification of teachers' work; conflict; and school culture. The second section focuses on implementation of change, highlighting the importance of vision building; professional development; administrative support and leadership; and assessment and continuance of change implementation. The paper concludes that real change represents a serious personal and collective experience characterized by ambivalence and uncertainty, and if it works out, change can result in a sense of mastery, accomplishment, and professional growth. It is imperative to understand that teachers: have different understandings of change, have personal and professional needs, need appropriate and adequate resources, need inservice training and continuous support, and want to be trusted and seen as capable professionals. Change must be a negotiated process viewed as a journey by individuals who have highly personal views and levels of understanding. (Contains 38 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 440 968

Teachers and Change: Examining the Literature

Denise G. Meister, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Education
Penn State Harrisburg

143 Deborah Drive
Wyomissing, PA 19610
USA

Phone: (610) 678-1479
Fax: (610) 678-4402
E-mail: dmeister@psu.edu

SP039205

BEST COPY AVAILABLE 2

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D.G. Meister

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Abstract

The typical pattern of reform movements is that they begin strongly yet whimper or die before any true change has occurred. The reason for this problem is the neglect of the phenomenology of change; that is, the neglect of how people directly involved in the initiative experience change in contrast to how it was intended.

This paper synthesizes the change literature that analyzes why reform is difficult for teachers to implement and how schools can alleviate some of the difficulty to assure effectiveness.

Teachers and Change:
Examining the Literature

Introduction

Analysts have noted a cyclical pattern of major reform movements: They erupt every decade or so, then recede to the background, leaving the larger educational picture only slightly altered and producing nominal changes in educational practice (Murphy, 1990). A major reason for this problem is that the neglect of the phenomenology of change--how people experience change in contrast to how it was intended--is at the "heart of the spectacular lack of success of most social reforms" (Fullan, 1991). Bogdan and Biklen (1992) write:

> Change is complicated because beliefs, lifestyles, and behavior come into conflict. People who try to change education, be it in a particular classroom or for the whole system, seldom understand how people involved in the changes think. Consequently, they are unable to accurately anticipate how the participants will react. Since it is the people in the setting who must live with the change, it is their definitions of the situation that are crucial if change is going to work. (p. 200)

How, then, can schools address the issue of implementing change that is meaningful and enduring? The purpose of this paper is to present the literature that supports looking at those who currently exist in the workplace and understanding the nature of change as it relates to them.

Understanding Change

Fullan (1991) writes that the problem of the meaning of change is learning how those involved in change can come to comprehend what should be changed and how it can be best accomplished while realizing that the what and the how constantly interact and reshape each other. He explains:

> In order to achieve greater meaning, we must come to understand both the small and big pictures. The small picture concerns the subjective meaning or lack of meaning for individuals at all levels of the educational system. Neglect of the phenomenology of change--that is, how people actually experience change as distinct from how it might have been intended --is at the heart of the spectacular lack of success of most social reforms. (p. 4)

Huberman and Miles' (1984) research concludes that successful implementation usually entails anticipating the painful, difficult aspects of change and taking measures to reduce their intensity or duration:

> Changing instructional and management practices frequently involves confusion, self-doubt, temporary setbacks, plateaus that seem to last forever, new procedures for daily work, shifts in institutional influence, and other uncertainty-arousing events that most people would rather not endure on a regular basis. (p. 72)

They conclude that understanding an innovation emerges from actually implementing it and making sense of what occurs as a result. Until that point teachers experience ambivalence in a change effort before the change is attempted (Fullan, 1991). Therefore, the way an innovation ultimately affects children depends on the lenses teachers use to view it and how they translate it into classroom practice (Murphy and Hallinger, 1993)

Research supports that there are five perceptions that teachers hold with regard to their work that must be realized for effective change to transpire. They are as follows: uncertainty, time, intensification, conflict, and culture.

Uncertainty

Teachers can never be certain how they are influencing students, which Lortie (1975) calls the "subjective reality of teachers." Under conditions of uncertainty, Fullan warns that "learning, anxiety, difficulties, and fear of the unknown are *intrinsic* to all change processes, especially at the early stages" (1993a, p. 25). Therefore, risk must be encouraged for teachers to venture into uncertainty. He also warns that sometimes things get worse before they get better and that at times, with the element of luck, things get better even if mistakes are being made.

Maeroff (1993, p. 46) reports that teachers struggle with the following questions when they are embarking on a new innovation: (a) Why are we changing? (b) What are we worried about losing or leaving behind? (c) What are we most uncertain about? (d) What do we have to unlearn? and (e) What are we committing ourselves to? He concludes

from his research that all these questions formulate teacher uncertainty--about the curriculum, about the way to assess, and about the best use of time.

Wideen (1992) has found that uncertainty can be managed through group process. He compares the change process to acquiring a new golf swing, pair of skates, or new laboratory procedure. Almost everyone's performance gets worse before improving, a phenomenon that Fullan (1991) calls the "implementation dip." By allowing teachers the support structure of a group setting, teachers are more apt to receive the time and encouragement to hone newly forming skills and counter initial anxiety. Wideen's research study found that the group atmosphere produced an ethos that allowed teachers to take risks and to implement the change more slowly and promoted a feeling of empowerment and ownership on the part of the teachers.

Huberman and Miles' (1984) research study found that, in the early stages of implementation, teachers were self-preoccupied, relegating student learning to a lower level of concern. The teachers complained of day-to-day coping, continuous cycles of trial and error, the inability to get through daily or weekly plans, and the sacrifice of other core activities. Apprehension, confusion, and distress--which resulted from feelings of professional inadequacy--as well as flaws in the innovation, and exhaustion were reported. In contrast, Huberman and Miles found that feelings greatly changed during later implementation. Teachers now reported feelings of self-efficacy, using terms such as "at ease" and "secure" with the new practice. In almost every case, the feelings of self-efficacy were attributed to mastering the innovation technically, thereby reducing the uncertainty. Teachers felt in control and gratified, which they attributed to successful results in terms of student performance increments and/or attitudes. They also measured success by short-term rewards, such as a "good day" and positive feedback from students. Thus, self-preoccupation gave way to student performance as the major area of concern.

Time

A major factor in a teacher's work day is time. Huberman (as cited in Fullan, 1991) based on his own research and that of others, summarizes the "classroom press" that exerts daily influences on teachers and monopolizes their time. The first *press* is for immediacy and concreteness, referring to the need for teachers to respond spontaneously to a classroom action. The second *press* is for multidimensionality and simultaneity, which refers to the teachers' need to carry on a range of operations simultaneously. The third *press* is for adapting to ever-changing conditions or unpredictability, explaining why schools are reactive organizations that must deal with an unstable input. The fourth *press* is for personal involvement with students, which refers to teachers' beliefs that personal relationships are important and requisite to academic learning. Huberman concludes that this *press* affects teachers in a number of different ways: they form short-term perspectives, focusing on day-to-day results; they become isolated from other adults; they exhaust their energy; they have limited opportunity for reflection about what they do; and they become more dependent on experiential knowledge in order to cope with their daily confines.

Corbett, Dawson and Firestone (1984) have concluded from their research that the most critical resource for successful implementation of an innovation is time. Constraints on staff time led to delays and alterations in the sequence of planning activities and to a reduction in the amount of local participation. In addition, the limited time of administrators to talk with teachers about change and to offer verbal encouragement had negative effects on the number of teachers who continued to use the new practices. Sikes (1992) adds that time becomes a more critical issue when changes are imposed. Since imposed change is usually a quick response to a perceived problem, teachers are rarely given sufficient time to study the change and to plan for it.

Hargreaves (1994) divides time into four dimensions: technical-rational, micropolitical, phenomenological, and sociopolitical. The technical-rational dimension sees time as a finite resource that can be increased or decreased; organized or reorganized;

managed and manipulated in order to accommodate chosen educational changes. Time, then, is an objective variable, which can be used to assist teachers in their implementation of change. Utilizing time for collaboration and teaming are examples of the technical-rational dimension or time. Fullan (1991) has concluded that even allowing small amounts of time for collaboration is beneficial. The micropolitical dimension of time reflects configurations of power and status within schools and school systems. Allotting more preparation time for core-subject teachers is an example of this dimension. Elementary school teachers, who spend the majority of the time in their classrooms, view teaching as the most important part of their work. Thus, trying to give these teachers more time for preparation and collaboration may go against their desire to remain with their students.

The phenomenological dimension of time refers to the subjective dimension of time, which differs and perhaps clashes with the time senses of administrators and innovators on the one hand and teachers on the others. Werner (as cited in Hargreaves, 1994, p. 101), who has studied the importance of time for the process of curriculum implementation, found that administrators and innovators are the guardians of "objective" or rational time. He adds that teachers do not experience time the same way, that they experience time within the context of their own classroom structures. His data show that teachers feel guilt and frustration because they cannot implement a new program as quickly and as efficiently as the administrative timeline dictates. Teachers see these imposed requirements as impossible mandates that ignore teachers' existing pressures and demands, as well as guidance requisite to integrating innovations with existing practices and routines. It is at this time when teachers' requests for more planning time or relaxed innovation timelines are apt to be strongest.

The sociopolitical dimension of time refers to the ways in which the particular forms of time become administratively dominant, which is a main element in the control of teachers' work and the curriculum implementation process. The first important part of this dimension is *separation*, which refers to the separation of time perspective between the

administration and the teachers. As administrators become more removed from the classroom, they become more narrowly focused on a single change that they are supporting and promoting. Thus, the change process appears to be moving too slowly to them. Teachers, on the other hand, are involved in various dimensions of the change while maintaining what already exists. Their tendency, then, is to simplify the change or slow it down so that the complicated world of the classroom can be kept manageable. From this clash between administration and teachers a paradox prevails:

> The quicker and more "unrealistic" the implementation timeline, the more the teacher tries to stretch it out. The more the teacher slows the implementation process down, the more impatient the administrator becomes and the more inclined he or she becomes to quicken the pace or tighten the timelines still further, or to impose yet another innovation, one more attempt to secure change. (Hargreaves, 1994, p. 108)

The second aspect of the dimension of sociopolitical time is *colonization* , the process where administrators take up or "colonize" teachers' time with their own purposes. Administrators regulate and control teachers' time, trying to eliminate leisure time. Teachers, however, resent colonization because they see leisure time spent talking with colleagues or relaxing in the faculty room as crucial to relieving stress and building trust and relationships in an informal setting.

> Hargreaves (1994) believes that teachers must be given more responsibility and flexibility in the management and allocation of their time, as well as more control of what will be developed in that time. Reallocated time begins when teachers are accepted as performing their job even when they are not in the presence of children (Maeroff, 1993). This process, however, becomes complex since teachers want to retain their day-to-day control over classroom reality

Intensification

In tandem with the issue of time is intensification of teachers' work: "a bureaucratically driven escalation of pressures, expectations and controls concerning what teachers do and how much they should do within the school day" (Apple as cited in Hargreaves, 1994, p. 108). Apple and Jungck (1992) refer to intensification as a "chronic sense of overload," from the trivial to the complex, and summarize the results of such demands as follows: (a) reduced time for relaxation at work and risk of isolation; (b) lack

of time to better one's craft and keep abreast of current issues in one's field; (c) dependence on externally produced materials and expertise, which jeopardizes teachers' self-trust and pride; (d) reductions in the quality of service because corners are cut to save time, and (e) devaluation of concerns of caring, connectedness, nurturing and fostering growth.

In addition, Hargreaves (1994) writes that two other aspects of intensification are specifically grounded in education. First, the implementation of prepackaged curriculum to change curriculum for already busy teachers thwarts the basic understanding that teachers need more preparation time. In return, less preparation time is allotted, and teachers rely on this externally imposed change instead of on the complex issues of internally developed and shared improvements, which require much more additional planning time. Second, the intensification process distorts teachers' views of professionalism as they struggle to incorporate additional responsibilities to their full teaching day out of a sense of professional dedication.

Huberman and Miles (1984) found that intensification played a major role during the early implementation stage. Teachers felt that they had too many simultaneous tasks to perform in the time available. They felt overloaded and energy depleted. Their solution was to trim the difficult and time-consuming parts and to develop time-saving algorithms such as this: "When only a week is left, select part x, continue y and z, and shorten a, b, and c" (p. 74). In addition, because of the overload, teachers felt they were unable to anticipate the immediate consequences of their actions or to come to some workable understanding of the project being implemented.

Barth (1990) records that schools are staffed with veteran, tenured personnel who have little horizontal or vertical mobility. Many of these teachers have the same classroom, the same books, the same curriculum, and the same colleagues for their entire teaching career. The only difference is their students. This routinization makes it even more difficult to change when teachers are expected to do more with less.

All these feelings of inadequacy lead to teacher guilt. Using Alan Davies work as his resource, Hargreaves (1994) divides teacher guilt into two categories. The first, persecutory guilt, derives from doing something that is forbidden by an external authority. In teaching, this comes from accountability demands and bureaucratic controls. Examples include teachers' believing they must cover the required content instead of creating more stimulating lessons or overtly but superficially complying with innovations that are unwanted or doubted or impractical. The second, depressive guilt, acquired in early childhood, occurs in situations where individuals feel they have ignored or betrayed the people or values whom they represent. Teachers feel this guilt when they do not believe they are meeting the needs of their students. Thus, in the context of teaching, caring for students is as important as doing what is right, two issues that become blocked when teachers meet impossible constraints.

Fullan (1991) believes that overloading teachers is a futile bureaucratic attempt to demonstrate to the outside that every effort is being made to improve achievement. He warns that the inevitable demands of overload cannot be prioritized and integrated at the political or administrative level. Instead, it must be done at the individual and small group level.

Conflict

Fullan (1993a) submits that conflict is essential to any successful change effort. Bolman and Deal (1991) agree, stating that change not only affects people's roles and skills, but also alters relationships of power and undermines existing agreements and, most importantly, intrudes upon deeply rooted symbolic agreements and ritualistic behavior Thus, people have a good reason to resist change:

> Changes in practices, procedures, or routine patterns undercut people's ability to perform their work with confidence and success. If they are told to make changes that they do not understand, moreover, they may wind up feeling puzzled and powerless. (Bolman and Deal, 1991, p. 378)

Hargreaves (1994) adds that conflict is inevitable because change is a micropolitical process, placing competing interests and purposes at stake. Glickman (1993) concurs:

> Public conflict indicates that an issue is important, that people see themselves as having a real influence on decisions, and that information about possible options and consequences is multiplying. The absence of public conflict in school change can be a danger sign. It can indicate that people do not care, do not believe that there is any merit in making their views known, and prefer to go along with whatever the most dominant persons have to say. (p. 92)

Gray (1989) warns that conflict is common even in collaborative groups who have shared a vision. The conflict arises when people have different ways to implement the vision. This conflict can be destructive if it reinforces hierarchy and silences participants by imposing one narrow standard of behavior on all participants (Gitlin et al., 1993). It can, however, be productive as long as the participants understand that conflict often arises from individual assumptions. Gray (1989, pp. 12-13) notes the following assumptions. The first is that people believe that their way of viewing a problem is the best, which may really mean the most rational, the fairest, the most intelligent, or perhaps the only way. These people lose sight of the possibility of multiple approaches to a problem.
The second assumption is that people believe that different interpretations are opposing interpretations. If people work through these interpretations, they often find that they are sharing the same concerns but have framed them differently or not listened carefully because of their own strong convictions. The third is that people stereotype others, thus discounting the legitimacy of another's point of view or restricting the flow of information between the stakeholders.

If conflict is not addressed, resistance to change may result. Lortie (1975) explains:

> Teachers have a built-in resistance to change because they believe that their work environment has never permitted them to show what they can really do. Many proposals for change strike them as frivolous--they do not address issues of boundedness, psychic rewards, time scheduling, student disruption, interpersonal support, and so forth. (p. 235)

Sikes (1992) claims that one way teachers can resist is by carrying on in the classroom as they always have. This is probably the most common response to change, especially among experienced teachers who are adept at ostensibly participating in the change process even though they are not. A common and serious mistake is the belief that teachers will automatically put change into practice. According to the research conducted

by Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin, & Hall (1987) in hundreds of schools, it is common to find at least 20 percent of teachers in any school who are nonusers even in the second and third years of implementation. Huberman (as cited in Sikes, 1992) has found that older teachers are not only resistant to change, but less likely to believe it will work. They make this assessment by drawing on their own experience and observation of previous changes.

Therefore, conflict cannot be ignored or dismissed, although the most common and most mistaken response to conflict in a school is to avoid it . This avoidance leads to fragmentation and division among faculty, separating those who advocate change and those who do not. Maeroff (1993) believes that avoidance of conflict can undermine communication and prevent resolution because a norm tends to arise that coerces people into hiding their feelings and emphasizing the rational parts of their interaction. Glickman (1993) adds schools that do not experience conflict in the beginning stages of change will harbor hidden conflicts in implementation, which will lead to resistance, second-guessing and subversion. Fullan (1993a) has found that successful schools do not have fewer problems; they just cope with them better. These schools do not label those in conflict as resisters or naysayers. Instead, they realize that addressing problems leads to the next level of understanding in the change process.

Culture

Culture is constructed reality. Havelock (1995) explains it this way:

> A social system is a group of people who have pooled their resources to satisfy needs they have in common. These common things bind them together psychologically so that "mine" becomes "ours" and "self-interest" becomes "our common interest." (p. 133)

Culture, thus, describes the way things are and gives them meaning and prescribes the way people should act (Rossman, Corbett, and Firestone, 1988; Hargreaves, 1994

Lortie (1975) concludes that beginning teachers are immediately immersed in a school's culture. These neophytes, assigned the same tasks as experienced teachers, must

learn "on the job" with little or no outside professional direction. The results of this induction into teaching are feelings of anxiety and isolation. Thus, those who survive this beginning period have imbued the culture of individualism and privatization. Hargreaves (1994) adds that the power to make independent judgments, and to exercise personal discretion, initiative and creativity through their work becomes important to many teachers so that individuality should not be confused with individualism.

Hargreaves (1994) adds that, besides the norms of isolation and alienation, other kinds of school culture exist:

> In general, these various cultures provide a context in which particular strategies of teaching are developed, sustained and preferred over time. In this sense, *cultures of teaching* comprise beliefs, values, habits and assumed ways of doing things among communities of teachers who have had to deal with similar demands and constraints over many years. Culture carries the community's historically generated and collectively shared solutions to its new and inexperienced membership. It forms a framework for occupational learning. (p. 165)

Therefore, in order to understand the things teachers do, one must understand the teaching community or work culture.

> The uniqueness of an individual setting, thus, is a critical factor in the implementation of change . In other words, reform is interpreted within a cultural framework. Webb, Corbett, and Wilson (1993) submit that, no matter how beneficial a particular reform might seem, its introduction into the schools will become part of a long history of innovative success and failure in that setting. Thus, Fullan (1991) argues the more that teachers have experienced negative attempts at implementing change, the more cynical or apathetic they may become toward new changes regardless of their merit

Therefore, it is imperative that schools find the means to strengthen bonds that tie school personnel together for meaningful change to occur. Barth (1990) believes this is difficult, however, because of the nature of adults' personal and professional relationships within schools. The first he calls "parallel play," borrowing a term that is commonly used in pre-school communities. Like children who play alone but try to influence the play of another, teachers develop subtle strategies for trying to influence the domain of others yet rarely venture there or relate meaningfully when they do. Mutual visibility is not a norm in the teaching profession. Teachers benefit from parallel play in that they are separated from those who may monopolize their time, challenge their practice, or use their ideas. The

negative is that teachers remain isolated. The second Barth calls "adversarial relationships." In these situations, when teachers do leave their parallel play, they often attack each other. They might belittle a teacher's idea to try to make themselves look better. Barth labels the third one "competitive relationships." These relationships are formed because of the need for one to excel above the others. Typically, it means withholding. Sharing a discipline technique or sharing any insight into teaching, for example, is considered hard won and private information. Also, teachers often do not want to articulate their insights for fear of being seen as pretentious by professing their knowledge.

Corbett, Dawson and Firestone (1984) found that one dimension of school organization that determines the extent to which innovative practices spread within a school is school linkage. In its simplest form, organizational linkage refers to the "degree to which parts of a system can function independently of one another" (p. 90). In a loosely linked school, teachers may either not react or react quite differently from the way the administrators had intended. In a more closely linked school, however, when one staff member acts, others have to respond. Thus, teachers who rarely have to coordinate their actions with others can facilitate instructional changes quickly, whereas teachers who must clear changes through appropriate channels have much less freedom. Weick (1982) believes that teachers' actions become richer and more satisfying when they are linked with important underlying themes and values. Corbett, Dawson, and Firestone (1984) found that the more linkages that exist, the more innovative practices will spread, citing the following indicators of linkage. The first is that a high percentage of teachers ranked the goals of the projects as the number one school goal, which indicates that the staff is linked by a common belief about the school's mission. The second is that teachers spent much time in departments or in appropriate grade level gatherings, discussing issues as opposed to listening to one person make a presentation, which indicates that teachers are more apt to develop a shared understanding and therefore implement a joint plan of instruction. The third is that high vertical bonds existed between formal policy and individual behavior,

which indicates that staff members comply with policies when they are consistently enforced.

Strong school cultures are built deliberately around tightly structured beliefs, values, and norms within a loosely coupled organization. Grimmett and Crehan (1992) explain the strength does not lie in the "tight" and "loose" formulation, but in the fact that the beliefs, values, and norms that are tightly structured have a highly specific professional focus.

Implementing Change

Fullan (1991) explains that people react to new experiences by attaching their own construction of reality to them regardless of the meaning others assign them. Thus, the implementation of educational change is never fully envisioned until the people in the particular situations attempt to spell them out in use:

> In short, one of the basic reasons why planning fails is that planners or decision-makers of change are unaware of the situations that potential implementers are facing. They introduce change without providing the means to identify and confront the situational constraints and without attempting to understand the values, ideas, and experiences of those who are essential for implementing any changes. (p. 96)

Fullan (1991) labels four main insights into successful implementation of change: (a) active initiation and participation; (b) pressure and support; (c) changes in behavior and beliefs; and (d) the problems of ownership. The literature regarding change supports four critical areas that address these five issues and facilitate the implementation process: vision, collaboration, professional development, administrative support and leadership, and assessessment and continuance of change.

Vision Building

Fullan (1991) believes that educational bandwagons are the result of having no vision. He adds that vision building "permeates the organization with values, purpose, and integrity for both the what and how of improvement" (p. 81). Hargreaves (1994) explains the importance of vision as follows:

> Through building common goals along with a shared expectation that they can be met, missions also strengthen teachers' sense of efficacy, their beliefs that they can improve the achievement of all their students, irrespective of background. Missions build motivation and missions bestow meaning. ...Developing a sense of mission builds loyalty, commitment and confidence in a school community. (p.163)

Miles (1987)) stresses that vision includes two dimensions. The first is a shared vision, demonstrating what a school can look like by providing direction and driving power for change. The second is a shared vision of the change process, showing a strategy for attaining change.

Gray (1989)believes that successfully advancing a vision requires identification and coordination of a diverse set of stakeholders, each one holding some but not all of the necessary resources, thereby realizing that lateral, not hierarchical, coordination is mandatory. If ownership of the school and of change implies individual rather than collective possession or imposed and hierarchical rather then democratic, vision cannot be defined as shared, the critical component to implementing change.

Collaboration

Fullan (1993a) writes people learn new patterns of behavior primarily through their interactions with others. Thus, change either does or does not work depending on the basis of individual and collective responses to it, implying that shared meaning and shared cognition, or "interactive professionalism" as Fullan (1991) has labeled it, play significant roles in the change process:

> In the final analysis it is the actions of the individual that count. Since interaction with others influences what one does, relationships with other teachers are a critical variable. The theory of change that we have been evolving clearly points to the importance of peer relationships in the school. Change involves learning to do something new , and interaction is the primary basis for social learning. (p.77)

Barth (1990) submits that teachers make decisions hundreds of times a day; yet they are excluded from important decisions that directly affect them, which produces feelings of inefficacy and isolation that erode the profession. Furthermore, because teachers are not closely involved in the decision-making process, they are not committed to the goals. Instead, they continue to work alone, according to Stoll (1992), making it difficult for them

to imagine collaborating with others. Gray (1989) reports that the most compelling evidence about omitting stakeholders from the decision-making process is that those with power to implement the decisions are excluded. Fullan (1991) concurs, noting that significant change consists of changes in beliefs, teaching style and materials, which can occur only through a process of personal development in a social context. Thus, Maeroff (1993) concludes that changing the school atmosphere usually depends on altering the informal rules by which teachers relate to one another.

Wideen (1992) writes that people learn, become inspired, and find their identity within the group; therefore, the group setting is a powerful vehicle for bringing about change. He adds, though, that certain norms, beliefs, expectations and support--such as ethos which allow for risk-taking and for slower paced implementation--are needed within the group setting for any change to occur. Fullan (1991) believes schools characterized by norms of collegiality and experimentation are much more likely to implement innovation successfully. Little (1981, as cited in Grimmett and Crehan, 1992, p. 56) reports that group work allows teachers to attempt curricular-instructional innovations that they probably would not have attempted on their own. Grimmett and Crehan (1992) found that it is not just the teamwork that creates the willingness to attempt new endeavors, but the joint action that emanates from the group's purposes and obligations as they shape the shared tasks and outcomes. Finally, Barth (1990) concludes that teachers working in a group are provided with a built-in support system, having someone to talk about their teaching and learning

Little (1981) defines collaboration as the presence of four specific behaviors in adults: (a) they talk about practice; (b) they observe each other engaged in the practice of teaching and administration; (c) they work together planning, designing, researching, and evaluating curriculum; and (d) they share craft knowledge. Gray (1989) proposes five features critical of the stakeholders for collaboration: (a) they are interdependent; (b) they solve differences by dealing with differences constructively; (c) they share ownership over

all decisions; (d) they share collective responsibility for the future direction of the domain; and (e) they view collaboration as an emergent process, not a temporary state. She concludes that, if collaboration is successful, new solutions emerge that could not have been envisioned or enacted by one person.

Watson and Fullan (1992) write that collaboration makes sense where stakeholders realize the potential advantages of working together, the interdependence to execute a vision they all share, and the interdependence to advance their own individual goals. Gary (1989(adds that stakeholders must see a compelling reason to collaborate; that is, they must believe that their interests will be protected and advanced throughout the process. Yet, trust is difficult to obtain, especially in school restructuring projects. Murphy and Hallinger (1993, p. 267) offer four reasons. First, in many schools trust is a structural phenomenon, spelled out in contracts, guidelines, and operating procedures and policies. In restructuring, however, trust must be less structured and more relational.
In restructuring, "game rules" change, and people find themselves in different roles . Second, restructuring creates conflict, confusion, and ambiguity, conditions that are not amenable to trust. Third, restructuring entails risk, which entails possible failure. The right to fail, however, is not a part of the school culture in this country. Therefore, failure is more likely to be viewed from a finger-pointing blame than a supportive stance.

Barth (1990) notes the following outcomes associated with collegiality: better decisions; better implementation of decisions; higher level of morale and trust among adults; energized adult learning, which is more likely to be sustained; some evidence of improved student motivation and achievement; and some evidence of more sharing and cooperating among students. Barth also notes that there are risks associated with collegiality because opening oneself to observation and communication means giving up something without knowing in advance what it may be.

Hargreaves (1994) notes that collaborative cultures are working relationships that are spontaneous, voluntary, development-oriented, fixed in time and space, and

predictable. If these conditions are not present, *contrived collegiality* is present. He submits that the following criteria can create contrived collegiality. First, teachers are required to meet and work together, which makes the collaboration administratively regulated and compulsory. Second, teachers are required to implement the mandates of others rather than programs decided upon through discussion. Third, teachers only meet at the particular time and place that has been mandated by the administration. Fourth, the collegiality is designed to have a high predictability of outcomes since the administration has control over its purposes and regulates its time and place. Fullan (1991) warns that contrived collegiality can lead to the proliferation of unwanted contacts among teachers, which consume already scarce time, causing resentment.

Another possible negative outcome to collegiality is *group think*. Fullan (1993a) defines group think as "the uncritical acceptance and/or suppression of dissent in going along with the group decisions."Therefore, it is important for the stakeholders to realize that collaboration does not require consensus. In addition, Fullan (1993a) warns that a majority decision does not necessarily mean sound judgment. Thus, questioning an innovation, especially at the early stages, should be welcomed.

In tandem with group think is *balkanization*, which occurs when strong loyalties form within a group, resulting in indifference or hostility to other groups. Hargreaves (1994, 1996) explains, in balkanized cultures, there are patterns of teachers working in smaller sub-groups within the school community, such as high school departments and elementary school primary divisions. Many times identities of these individuals are formed through their subject traditions, which means understanding their loyalties from an historical prior tradition. Thus, balkanization can and does have negative consequences for student and teacher learning. Hargreaves (1994) notes three qualities that promote balkanization: (a) sub-groups are insulated from each other, becoming exclusive to one group more than any other; (b) few teachers move within groups from year to year, thereby classifying themselves as specific teachers (e.g. English teachers or elementary school

teachers); and (c) teachers become attached to the sub-group with which they belong and tend to view all issues from that perspective alone. To solve this issue, Hargreaves (1994) suggests that some sense of wholeness be constructed in schools, such as whole-school curriculum development and whole-school commitments to missions and visions of educational purpose.

Professional Development

Bolman and Deal (1991) write that change creates feelings of incompetence and insecurity because it undercuts people's ability to perform their work with confidence and success. They use the example of surgeons who have adeptly performed a surgical procedure over a long period of time. When the use of laser replaces the scalpel for the same procedure, the doctors' self-actualization may regress, leaving feelings of insecurity and incompetence until they receive training and support. Fullan (1991) adds that the difficulty of learning new skills and behavior and unlearning old ones is underestimated and that changes in beliefs, practice, and methods represent profound changes that affect teachers' professional self-development. Huberman and Miles (1984) add that in the early stages of implementing change, people must perceive that the needs being addressed are pertinent and that they are making some progress toward meeting them. Barth (1990) believes that professional growth is closely related to relationships within schools:

> Probably nothing within a school has more impact on students in terms of skills development, self-confidence, or classroom behavior than the personal and professional growth of their teachers. The crux of teachers' professional growth, I feel, is the development of a capacity to observe and analyze the consequences for students of different teaching behaviors and materials, and to learn to make continuous modifications of teaching on the basis of cues students convey. Teachers also need to be able to relate their classroom behavior to what other teachers are doing in their classrooms. (p. 49)

Unfortunately, Barth (1990) believes that most school districts operate from a "deficit" model of adult growth. In this model, staff development means workshops conducted by outsiders with little or no change evident in practice. Typically these workshops contain little interaction among participants and become simple attempts at group growth. Yet, staff development can be a strategy for basic organizational change in

the ways schools operate. Better teaching and improved learning can only be realized when professional development is no longer viewed as a fragmented add-on to what teachers do.

First, however, Fullan and Hargreaves (1992) believe four major elements of teacher development must be understood. First is the teacher's *purpose*, which refers to the things that teachers' value and that they want to achieve in their teachings, as well as the things that they value, which they believe will not work or will make matters worse. Therefore, teacher development must respect and support teachers' voice; must allow teachers the opportunity to confront the beliefs and assumptions that underlie their practice; must avoid fads and blanket implementation of new instructional strategies; and must create a community who develop their purposes and goals through discussion. Second is the teacher as a *person*, which refers to the differences in teachers as they relate to their individuality, such as their age, stage of career, and gender. Third is the real world *context* in which teachers work, which means that different grade levels and different subject areas account for different social contexts. Fourth is the *culture* of teaching, which refers to the working relationship that teachers have with colleagues inside and outside the school.

Purpose, person, context, and culture can be understood and addressed by conceptualizing teacher development more thoroughly, which means allowing teachers to voice their concerns, work out their differences, and collaborate for fuller understanding (Fullan and Hargreaves, 1992). Hargreaves (1996) explains:

> Teachers give meaning to change by grounding it in their own personal, practical knowledge and experience. However, where school leaders are unable or unwilling to give teachers access to knowledge and experience that are closely connected to the focus of the change, teachers' only resource is to draw on their own reserves of personal and practical knowledge and experience that are vaguely analogous to the change at hand, but which may be anachronistic in relation to it. (p. 15)

Maeroff, Hargreaves, Fullan, and Barth all believe professional development will become a basic component of the professional lives of teachers only when schools become places where teachers learn formally and informally on a daily basis; when teacher development promotes self-understanding; when risk taking is promoted. Hargreaves and

Fullan (1992) add another way is to provide teachers with the knowledge and skill development which will increase their ability to provide opportunities for the children to learn. Although knowledge and skills-based approaches can be criticized as top-down mandates that ignore the teachers' experience and voice, it can be beneficial if its use is limited to focusing on the methods that are understandable and usable by teachers in the classroom, as well as presented with ongoing administrative support. Joyce and Showers (1995) advocate programs such as peer coaching to alleviate the aforementioned problems by allowing teachers to practice and risk with each other by implementing an innovation, which, in turn, can build a community of teachers who continuously engage in the study of their craft, develop a shared language and common understanding that are necessary for collaborative study of new knowledge and skills, and provide a structure for follow-up training that is requisite for acquiring new teaching skills and strategies .

Fullan (1991) warns that in-service work is crucial during the implementation stage of change, stating that it is only when people try to implement new approaches and reforms that they have the most specific concerns and doubts. He expounds:

> Need, clarity, and the personal benefit/cost ratio must be favorable on balance at some point relatively early in implementation. Ambivalence about whether the change will be favorable is nearly always experienced before the change is attempted. It is only by trying something that we can really know if it works. The problem is compounded because first attempts are frequently awkward, not providing a fair test of the idea. Support during initial trials is critical for getting through the first stages, as is some sign of progress. (p. 129)

Hopkins (1990) warns that teachers must be familiar with the subject both in terms of its propositional content and its methodological structure; otherwise, teachers will claim they are using the practice, but, in reality, are not. Therefore, Hopkins continues, implementation planning must focus on knowledge and skill acquisition over time. Hord et al. (1987) refer to this time period as Level 3, the need for comfort and caring. They explain that teachers, especially in the early stages of use, are only one step ahead of their students; therefore, management of students and time becomes difficult. Teachers need to

be grouped so that they can discuss common problems with a facilitator who can provide technical assistance as well as build a mutual support system.

Administrative Support and Leadership

Fullan (1991) warns the test of whether a change has been taken seriously by the district administrator comes forcefully at the implementation stage, making the district administrator the single most important person for setting the expectations and tone of the change pattern within the local school district. Adopted change will not be implemented on any scale unless the central staff provides specific advocacy by maintaining a serious commitment to change, exerting direct influence, using its power to protect the innovation from opportunistic adaptation, and supplying a steady flow of support (Huberman and Miles, 1984). Fullan (1991) adds:

> Successful administrators operate implicitly or explicitly from a basic set of principles--a theory of change. A theory of change,..., combines knowledge about factors that inhibit or facilitate change and knowledge about how to influence or alter these factors in more favorable directions. (p.198)

(Huberman and Miles (1984) submit that building support, usually by the principal, is crucial, especially in the early stages of the change process. Wideen (1992) reports from his research that the conceptual leadership of the principal is a significant factor in the change process:

> The principal showed a type of intellectual persistence regarding the issues surrounding the innovation, and the view of professionalism which guided his actions carried with it certain values about education both for himself and the staff. (p. 140)

Yet much research shows that the principal does not play an active role even though his leadership is crucial.

Maeroff (1993) writes that outstanding teachers report that their ability to succeed is enhanced by a supportive and understanding principal. These teachers tend to be risk takers and feel a sense of safety because their principals do not condemn failure that is

connected to a sincere and informed effort on behalf of change. Lieberman and Miller (1984) concur, stating that teachers who view their principals as critical or punishing will not take risks. Wideen (1992) has concluded from his research that the principal's attitude toward professionalism and a vision of a better education for children appear to be the foundation that supports change.

There are several general characteristics of a good principal: negotiates solutions to problems, uses collegial management styles, takes risks, generates warmth and caring, has low personal control needs, juggles multiple priorities with ease, and puts relationships first (Robertson, 1992). Little (1981) found the ways to promote collegial relationships are closely related to four specific behaviors of principals: (a) states expectations explicitly for cooperation among teachers, (b) models collegiality, (c) rewards collegiality, and (d) protects teachers who initially engage in collegial behavior. Wideen (1992) writes that the principal in his study demonstrated support by providing release time for the teachers, finding money to support their efforts, and taking risks with them by trying out new teaching ideas. Thus, teachers perceived a fairness about him and a willingness to share decision making. Corbett, Dawson, and Firestone (1984) report that building administrators can facilitate change by engaging in informal talks with the faculty, by discussing issues regarding the innovation at staff meetings, and by including staff progress toward the building or district goal on the formal evaluation.

Assessment and Continuance of Change Implementation

Fullan (1991) writes that implementing any new program is dependent on three dimensions: (a) the possible use of new or revised *materials*; (b) the possible use of new teaching *approaches*; and (c) the possible alteration of *beliefs* . It is critical, therefore, that a newly innovated program is assessed for implementation.

Crucial to assessing the implementation of an innovation is first developing a time frame needed for ensuring that complex changes can unfold and begin to produce desired

results. Much of the research suggests that true assimilation of an innovation into daily classroom practice will take anywhere from 18 months until 2 years (Corbett, Dawson, Firestone, 1984) and up until 5 years (Fullan, 1991). Havelock (1995) adds that continued evaluation ensures against slippage in the quality of the innovation as well as provides incentive and reminder that the innovation is still supposed to be in operation

Fullan (1991) writes effective change involves modification, both cognitive and behavioral, on the part of the students as well as the teachers, and all implementation comprises a change in the role relationships between teachers and students. Therefore, assessment must include the students' reactions to the change, as well as their learning outcomes. The paradox, however, is that student outcome data cannot be considered until the degree of implementing the innovation is ascertained. Thus, Hord (1987) warns the need to identify exactly what teachers are doing with the innovation so they can be assisted. Evaluation as such aims for discovering the areas of improvement that must be addressed for successful implementation.

Havelock (1995) submits that providing for continuing maintenance must be a built-in function of change; otherwise, there will be a rapid erosion of acceptance after failures begin to occur. Hord et al. (1987) explain:

> After teachers start to use a new program or practice, monitoring activity can be influential in reminding teachers that their attention is required for the program. It helps teachers recognize that the improvement project is a priority, that a commitment has been made to it, and that somebody cares about them, about the change, and how it is occurring in classrooms. Monitoring is also a natural complement to consultation/reinforcement in that it provides valuable data about how individuals are doing and what their assistance needs might be. (p. 77)

Fullan (1991) adds two more reasons for monitoring. First, making information on innovative practices available provides access to good ideas. Second, this information exposes new ideas to scrutiny, which helps discard mistakes and develop promising practices. Havelock (1995) reports that this monitoring will assist evaluators for unanticipated outcomes, both positive and negative: (a) what does the project do for the morale of the group? (b) to what extent is it seen as something disruptive or exciting? (c)

does it change attitudes or choices? and (d) are there effects on nonparticipants, parents, community, and/or administrators?

Research shows that the provision of opportunities for discussions about and reinforcement for continuing new practices is crucial to maintaining change (Corbett, Dawson, and Firestone, 1984). Discussions should allow teachers to share their successes, failures, and ongoing concerns (Fullan, 1991). Group discussion has special advantages: it is less time consuming and costly than personal contact; it increases the feelings of safety and the willingness to take risks; it moves the individual user toward a deeper commitment to the innovation; and it legitimizes feelings of doubt (Havelock, 1995). Hord et al. (1987) call this time period Level 4, routine and refinement. During routinization, teachers need recognition and praise, as well as monitoring that they are properly implementing the innovation. During refinement, teachers need sanction and support, especially from peer observations, as they make shifts and moderate changes in their use (Corbett, Dawson, and Firestone, 1984; Havelock, 1995; and Hord, 1987). This type of collaboration or school community further implements change by encouraging people at different levels of proficiency and achievement to work together on common priorities (Glickman, 1993, p. 79).

CONCLUSION

Fullan (1991) writes that real change represents a "serious personal and collective experience characterized by ambivalence and uncertainty; and if the change works out it can result in a sense of mastery, accomplishment, and professional growth" (p. 32). He adds that the more familiar people become at dealing with the unknown, the more they can understand how creative breakthroughs are preceded by confusion, exploration, and stress, followed by periods of excitement and increasing confidence as they implement meaningful change or cope with unwanted change. It is imperative, then, according to Sikes (1992), that the following realities be recognized: (a) teachers have different understandings of change; (b) teachers have personal and professional needs; (c) teachers need appropriate

and adequate resources; (d) teachers need in-service training and continuous support; and (e) teachers want to be trusted and seen as capable professionals. Lortie (1975) concurs and expounds:

> Change is impeded by mutual isolation, vague yet demanding goals, dilemmas of outcome assessment, restricted in-service training, rigidities in assignment, and working conditions which produce a "more-of-the-same" syndrome among classroom teachers. (p. 232)

Change, therefore, must be a "negotiated process" (Fullan, 1991). It must be viewed as a journey by individuals who have highly personal views and levels of understanding, which are evident in the different ways that they develop through a change endeavor (Hord, 1987, p. 6). Likening reform to Sisyphus, the figure in Greek mythology whose daily task is to push a boulder up a mountain only to have it roll down at the moment he reaches the top, Louis and King (1993) state:

> Sisyphus is a symbol and touchstone for all committed professionals who believe that we labor long and hard at tasks that, at best, we can only partially or temporarily accomplish. We admire Sisyphus. He perseveres, his will undaunted by impossible circumstance. ...At the same time, though, we marvel that he keeps struggling up that mountain without analyzing why he cannot accomplish his task. If evidence repeatedly suggests that a job can't be done, isn't it better to reorganize the activity so that you can at least accomplish something of worth? This essential dilemma--between commitment-perseverance, on the one hand, and practicality-compromise, on the other--is played out repeatedly in the life of educational reformers who work in schools. (p. 217)

To acknowledge these complexities and to engage in addressing them is the dawn of successful change and meaningful reform.

References

Apple, M.W., & Jungck, S. (1992). "You don't have to be a teacher to teach this unit: Teaching, technology and control in the classroom. In Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M.G. (Eds.), Understanding Teacher Development (pp. 20-42). NY: Teachers College Press.

Barth, R.S. (1990). Improving schools from within: Teachers, parents, and principals can make a difference. CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bogdan, R.C., & Biklen, S.K. (1992). Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods. MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Bolman, L.G., & Deal, T.E. (1991). Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership. CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers

Clark, C.M. (1992). Teachers as designers in self-directed professional development. In Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M.G. (Eds.), Understanding Teacher Development (pp. 75-84). NY: Teachers College Press.

Corbett, H.D., Dawson, J.A., & Firestone, W.A. (1984). School context and school change: Implications for effective planning. NY: Teachers College Press.

Darling-Hammer, L., & Wise, A. (1985). "Beyond standardization: state standards and school improvement," in Elementary School Journal, 85, 3, Falmer.

Fullan, M. (1990). Staff development, innovation, and institutional development. In Joyce, B. (Ed)., Changing school culture through staff development (pp. 3-25). VA: Association of Curriculum and Supervision Development.

Fullan, M. (1993a). Change forces: Probing the depths of educational reform. Bristol, PA: The Falmer Press.

Fullan, M. (1993b). Coordinating school and district development in restructuring. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Restructuring schools: Learning from ongoing efforts (pp. 143-164). CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Fullan, M. G. (with Stiegelbauer, S.). (1991). The new meaning of educational change. NY: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M., & Hargreaves, A. (1992). "Teacher development and educational change. In M.Fullan & A. Hargreaves (Eds.), Teacher Development and Educational Change (pp. 1-9). Washington, D.C.: The Falmer Press.

Gitlin, A., Bringhurst, K., Burns, M., Cooley, V., Myers, B., Price, K., Russell, R., & Tiess, P. (1992). Teachers' voices for school change: An introduction to educative research. NY: Teachers College Press.

Glickman, C.D. (1993). Renewing America's schools: A guide for school-based action. CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Gray, B. (1989). Collaborating: Finding common ground for multiparty problems. CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Grimmett, P.P., & Crehan, E.P. (1992). The nature of collegiality in teacher development: The case of clinical supervision. In M.Fullan & A. Hargreaves (Eds.), Teacher Development and Educational Change (pp. 56-85). Washington, D.C.: The Falmer Press.

Hargreaves, A. (1994). Changing teachers, changing times: Teachers' work and culture in the postmodern age. NY: Teachers College Press.

Hargreaves, A. (1996). Revisiting voice. Educational Researcher, 25 (1), 12-19.

Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (1992). Introduction. In Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M.G. (Eds.), Understanding Teacher Development (pp. 1-19). NY: Teachers College Press.

Havelock, R.G. with Zlotolow, S. (1995). The change agent's guide. 2nd ed. NJ: Educational Technology Publications.

Hopkins, D. (1990). Integrating staff development and school improvement: A study of teacher personality and school climate. In Joyce, B (Ed.), Changing school culture through staff development (pp. 41-67). VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Hord, S.M., Rutherford, W.L., Huling-Austin, L., & Hall, G.E. (1987). Taking charge of change. VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Huberman A.M., & Miles, M.B. (1984). Innovation up close: How school improvement works. NY: Plenum Press.

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1995). Student achievement through staff development: Fundamentals of school renewal. 2nd ed. NY: Longman Publishers.

Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (1984). Teachers, their world, and their work. VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Lortie, D.C. (1975). Schoolteacher: A sociological study. IL: University of Chicago Press.

Louis, K.S., & King, J.A. (1993). Professional cultures and reforming schools: Does the myth of Sisyphus apply? In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Restructuring schools: Learning from ongoing efforts (pp. 216-250). CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Maeroff, G.I. (1993). Team building for school change: Equipping teachers for new roles. NY: Teachers College Press.

Murphy, J. (1990). The educational reform movement of the 1980s: A comprehensive analysis. In J. Murphy (Ed.), The Educational Reform Movement of the 1980: Perspectives and Cases. CA: McCutchan Publishing Company.

Murphy, J. (1991). Restructuring schools: Capturing and assessing the phenomena. NY: Teachers College Press.

Murphy J., & Hallinger, P. (1993). Restructuring schools: Learning from ongoing efforts. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Restructuring schools: Learning from ongoing efforts (pp. 251-272). CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Robertson, H. (1992). Teacher development and gender equity. In Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M.G. (Eds.), Understanding Teacher Development (pp. 43-61). NY: Teachers College Press.

Rossman, G.B., Corbett, H.D., & Firestone, W.A. (1988). Change and effectiveness in schools: A cultural perspective. NY: State University of NY Press.

Sikes, P.J. (1992). Imposed change and the experienced teacher. In M.Fullan & A. Hargreaves (Eds.), Teacher Development and Educational Change (pp. 36-55). Washington, D.C.: The Falmer Press.

Stoll, L. (1992). Teacher growth in the effective school. In M.Fullan & A. Hargreaves (Eds.), Teacher Development and Educational Change (pp. 104-122). Washington, D.C.: The Falmer Press.

Watson, N., & Fullan, M.G. (1992). Beyond school district-university partnerships. In M.Fullan & A. Hargreaves (Eds.), Teacher Development and Educational Change (pp. 213-242). Washington, D.C.: The Falmer Press.

Webb, J., Corbett, H.D., & Wilson, B.L. (1993). Restructuring systematically for students: Can it be more than just talk? In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Restructuring schools: Learning from ongoing efforts (pp. 188-215). CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Wideen, M.F. (1992). School-based teacher development. In M.Fullan & A. Hargreaves (Eds.), Teacher Development and Educational Change (pp. 123-155). Washington, D.C.: The Falmer Press.